

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are all the claims currently pending in this Application. Claims 13-17 and 25-27 are withdrawn pursuant to the Amendment in Response to Restriction Requirement, filed May 18, 2007. Applicants note that on the cover page of the current Office Action, the Examiner mistakenly lists only claims 1-12 and 18-24 as pending.

Claim Amendment

With this Amendment, Applicants amend claim 1, as shown, to correct a minor grammatical informality. Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment is not intended to narrow the scope of the original claim, but are rather for precision of language and to explicitly recite within the claim what was believed to have already been implicitly defined therein. Accordingly, this amendment does not foreclose application of reasonable equivalents.

Furthermore, this amendment does not change the scope of the claim, and therefore, would not necessitate any new grounds of rejection, and therefore, any finality of any Office Action based on this Amendment would be improper and premature.

Prior Art Rejection

Claims 1-12 and 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Robertson (U.S. Patent 6,594,799). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Robertson is generally directed to a method and system for facilitating electronic circuit design using remote resources. As described in col. 6, lines 20-36, electronic component data is stored in a database which can be accessed by a remote user's workstation. The database includes information on part lead time, availability, cost, timing information, and other information regarding specific components. A portal site, linked to end user systems and

suppliers via the internet, may act as a server which can provide design software, component databases, computing and processing resources, virtual circuit blocks, expert assistance, and IC fabrication.

Regarding claims 1, 2, 7, and 8, the Examiner acknowledges that Robertson fails to disclose “an account terminal which transfers payment for utilizing the design database from a bank account of the designer” (claim 1, see also claim 7). However, Robertson describes that a determination may be made as to whether the portal site is handling the billing for the transaction. If not, an invoice may be generated and sent *from the portal site to a supplier*. Terms may be agreed upon *between a supplier and the operator of the portal site*. Invoicing and payment may be electronic or on paper. A supplier may maintain an *account at the portal site* which may be automatically debited. (Robertson, col. 14, lines 28-48). In view of this portion of Robertson, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to transfer payment from a bank account of the designer. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner is mistaken.

The “designer” of the present invention is comparable to the “user” as described in Robertson. There is no teaching or suggestion in Robertson of any invoicing, billing, or payment having anything to do with the *user*. As noted above, all invoicing, billing, and payment is described as *between a supplier and the portal site or an operator of the portal site*. Therefore, there is no teaching or suggestion of transferring payment from a *designer* bank account, as claimed. Further, as described, an invoice to be paid *may be sent to a supplier, or a supplier may maintain an account at the portal site*. However, there is no teaching or suggestion of transferring any payment to or from a *bank account*, as claimed. The only account described in

Robertson is not a bank account, but rather a separate account which a supplier may maintain in conjunction with the portal site.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 7 are non-obvious in view of Robertson, and that claims 2 and 8 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependence.

Regarding claims 3-12 and 25-27, Applicants further submit that these claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependence on claim 1 or claim 7.

Furthermore, regarding claims 3, 9, and 24, the Examiner acknowledges that Robertson fails to disclose transferring an employment fee from a bank account of a parts vendor to the bank account of the designer, upon employment of a part by the designer, as claimed. Applicants submit that the Examiner is mistaken. As discussed above, Robertson fails to teach or suggest the utilization of any bank account. Furthermore, all financial transactions as discussed in Robertson are between a supplier and the portal site or an operator of the portal site. There is no teaching or suggestion of any financial transactions *between a parts vendor and a designer*, as claimed. Therefore, Applicants submit that based on the above, claims 3, 9, and 24 are additionally patentable over Robertson.

Regarding claims 5, 6, 11, and 12, the Examiner acknowledges that Robertson fails to disclose means for conducting a price simulation or means for conducting a noise simulation. Regarding these limitations, the Examiner notes that Robertson describes that users who may need extra computing power for running a simulation program can be connected to suppliers who have computing power resources by matching users with a computing site or resource. However, contrary to the assertions of the Examiner connecting a user with a site or resource which can provide computing power for running a simulation program does not teach or suggest actually

providing a means for running a specific price simulation or noise simulation. There is no teaching or suggestion in Robertson of providing any noise information and no teaching or suggestion of any need for any noise information or noise simulation. Therefore, Applicants submit that based on the above, claims 5, 6, 11, and 12 are additionally patentable over Robertson.

Regarding claims 18, and 22, as discussed above, there is no teaching or suggestion in Robertson of providing any noise information or anti-noise information and no teaching or suggestion of any need or desire for any anti-noise circuit. Therefore, contrary to the assertions of the Examiner, one of skill in the art would not have found a design database including information on an anti-noise circuit obvious in view of Robertson. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 18 and 22 are additionally patentable over Robertson.

Therefore, in view of the above, Applicants submit that claims 1-12 and 18-24 are patentable over Robertson and respectfully request that the rejection thereof be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

Application No.: 09/828,889

Q63958

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Laura Moskowitz

Registration No. 55,470

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 9, 2007